

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 11 and 31 have been amended to correct typographical errors. Claims 1, 15 and 28 have also been amended. Claims 1 – 35 are currently pending.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 – 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenzweig, *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,950,989 (“Rosenzweig”), in view of Misawa, *et al.*, U.S. Publn. No. 2003/0154190 (“Misawa”).

Claims 1 - 14

Claims 1 – 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenzweig in view of Misawa. Independent claim 1 has been amended in response to this rejection. Specifically, claim 1 now recites “automatically generating one or more group titles for at least a portion of said one or more groups, wherein said one or more group titles indicate at least one keyword associated with the items in one of said one or more groups.” Applicants respectfully submit that neither Rosenzweig nor Misawa, either alone or in combination, teaches this aspect of the claimed invention.

To teach group titles, the Office Action relies on Rosenzweig. Rosenzweig teaches a graphical user interface which uses metadata to provide a timeline to be used along with a digital picture database. Rosenzweig, Abstract. Though Rosenzweig’s focus is on timelines, Rosenzweig also teaches dividing digital pictures into groups based on other characteristics, such as events, locations and persons. Col. 4, l. 38 – col. 5, l. 8.

Though Rosenzweig teaches the dividing of pictures according to different characteristics, Rosenzweig is silent as to the automatic generation of group titles based on a shared keyword associated with the items in the group. Indeed, Rosenzweig teaches only the use of generic titles, *i.e.*, “Event 4” and “Person 5,” and provides no explanation as to techniques for generating group titles indicating a specific keyword associated with images in a group. *See* col. 5, ll. 1 – 8; FIGS. 7 – 9. Thus, it is clear that Rosenzweig does not teach “automatically generating one or more group titles for at least a portion of said one or more groups, wherein said one or more group titles indicate at least one keyword associated with the items in one of said one or more groups,” as required by amended independent claim 1. Misawa also does not teach this aspect of the claimed invention. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Applicants also submit that dependent claims 2-14, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 15 - 27

Claims 15 – 27 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenzweig in view of Misawa. Independent claim 15 has been amended in response to this rejection. Specifically, claim 15 now recites a “table of contents area further displaying volume information for each of the groups in said listing, wherein said volume information is presented within the listing.” Applicants respectfully submit that neither Rosenzweig nor Misawa, either alone or in combination, teaches this aspect of the claimed invention.

To teach the claimed table of contents area, the Office Action relies on Misawa. Misawa teaches an image display apparatus and methods for image management. Figures 14 – 16 of Misawa provide various user interfaces for displaying images. To teach the claimed table

of contents, the Office Action relies on the folder-tree shown on Figures 14 – 16. The Office Action further cites the bottom row of these figures to teach the claimed volume information. Office Action, p. 8. This bottom row provides the number of objects contained in a single, selected folder.

Notably, the display of Misawa does not indicate the number of items in each of the folders in the folder-tree; a user must select a given folder before the number of items is displayed. Moreover, the volume information of Misawa is not provided along with the folder-tree. Rather, the volume information is displayed in a pane that is separate and apart from the folder-tree.

In contrast, amended independent claim 15 now recites a “table of contents area further displaying volume information for each of the groups in said listing, wherein said volume information is presented within the listing.” Misawa fails to teach such a table of content at least because it provides the number of items for only a single, selected folder and because it fails to teach the providing of volume information within the listing of groups, as required by amended independent claim 15. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is in condition for allowance. Applicants also submit that dependent claims 16-27, which depend from claim 15, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 15.

Claims 28 - 35

Claims 28 – 35 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenzweig in view of Misawa. Independent claim 28 has been amended in response to this rejection. Specifically, claim 28 now recites a “group title generation component configured to automatically generate one or more group titles for at least a portion of one or more groups of

items, wherein said one or more group titles indicate at least one keyword associated with the items in one of said one or more groups.” Claim 28 also now recites a “table of contents further displaying volume information within said listing for each of the one or more of groups.”

The newly-added limitations of claim 28 have been previously discussed. As discussed with respect to claim 1, neither Rosenzweig nor Misawa teaches the automatic generation of group titles based on a shared keyword that is associated with the items in the group. Moreover, neither Rosenzweig nor Misawa teaches a “table of contents [that] further displays volume information for each of the one or more of groups within said table of contents,” as required amended independent claim 28. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 28 is in condition for allowance. Applicants also submit that dependent claims 29-35, which depend from claim 28, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 28.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, claims 1 – 35 are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Reckers/

Robert H. Reckers
Reg. No. 54,633

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: 816/474-6550
Fax: 816-421-5547